arXiv:1612.03742v1 [math.OC] 12 Dec 2016

Formation of coalition structures as a non-cooperative game 2: applications

Dmitry Levando, *

Abstract

The paper uses a non-cooperative simultaneous game for coalition structure formation (Levando, 2016) to demonstrate some applications of the introduced game: a cooperation, a Bayesian game within a coalition with intra-coalition externalities, a stochastic game, where states are coalition structures, self-enforcement properties of non-cooperative equilibrium and construction of a non-cooperative stability criterion.

Keywords: Noncooperative Games, Cooperation, Bayesian Games, Stochastic Games,
JEL : C72, C73

1 Subject of the paper

The previous paper, Levando (2016), introduced a non-cooperative game to study coalition structures formation as a non-cooperative game. The suggested game consisted of a set of players N[1], a coalition structure construction mechanism $(\{K, \mathcal{P}(K), \mathcal{R}(K)\})$, and individual properties of players,

*Special thanks to Fuad Aleskerov, Shlomo Weber and Lev Gelman.
E-mail for correspondence: dlevando (at) hse.ru.
[1]Size of the set N will be also denoted as N, if there is no ambiguity in notation.

$(S_i(K),\mathcal{U}(K))_{i\in N}$, such that

$$\Gamma(K)=\Big\langle K,\{K,\mathcal{P}(K),\mathcal{R}(K)\},(S_i(K),\mathcal{U}_i(K))_{i\in N}\Big\rangle,$$

where K is a maximum coalition size or a maximum number of deviators, $\mathcal{P}(K)$ is a family of coalition structures such that any coalition size (a number of deviators) does not exceed K, $\mathcal{R}(K)$ is a family of specific coalition structure formation rules, $S_i(K)$ is a corresponding set of strategies of $i\in N$ induced by K, $\mathcal{U}_i(K)$ is family of specific coalition structure payoffs for i in every partition $P\in\mathcal{P}(K)$. Games for all relevant K make a nested family

$$\Gamma=\{\Gamma(K=1),\dots,\Gamma(K),\dots\Gamma(K=N)\}\colon \Gamma(K=1)\subset\Gamma(K)\subset\Gamma(K=N).$$

The family of games is characterized by a list of equilibrium strategy profiles, $\Big(\sigma^*(1),\dots,\sigma^*(K),\dots,\sigma^*(K=N)\Big)$, where $\sigma^*(K)=(\sigma_i^*(K))_{i\in N}$. and by a list of equilibrium partitions, $\Big(\{P^*\}(1),\dots,\{P^*\}(K),\dots,\{P^*\}(K=N)\Big)$, $\{P^*\}(K)\subset\mathcal{P}(K)$. Every game $\Gamma(K)$ from a family Γ, which has an equilibrium may be in mixed strategies.

This paper demonstrates applications of the constructed game for: self-interest cooperation, a Bayesian stochastic game, studying self-enforcing properties of an equilibrium and construction of a non-cooperative criterion of coalition structure stability.

2 Cooperation

To explain formally cooperation we will retell with necessary changes the example from the corporate dinner game in Levando (2016). The result of this example will be used to explain formal definition of what a cooperation in allocations of self-interest players can be. In this section the term "cooperation" means only a cooperation of players in allocations over coalitions.

Cooperation in payoffs is not addressed here.

2.1 Cooperation in a corporate dinner game

Consider a game of 4 players: A is a President; B is a senior vice-president; C_1, C_2 are two other vice-presidents. Coalition is a group of players at *one* table. Every player may sit only at one table. Coalition structure is an allocation of all players over no more than four tables. Empty tables are not taken into account.

Individual set of strategies is a set of all coalition structures for the players. Any player can choose a coalition structure. A set of strategies in the game is a direct (Cartesian) product of four individual strategy sets. A choice of all players is a point in the set of strategies of the game.

Preferences are such that everyone (besides A) would like to have a dinner with A, but A only with B. Everyone wants players outside his table to eat individually, due to possible dissipation of rumors or information exchange. No one can enforce others to form or not to form coalitions.

In every partition any coalition (i.e. a table with players who eat at the table) is formed only if everybody at the table agrees to have dinner together, otherwise the player eats alone. The same coalition belongs to different coalitions, but with different allocations of other players over other coalitions.

The game is simultaneous and one shot. Realization of the final partition (a coalition structure) depends on choices of coalition structures of all players. Example. Let player A choose $\{\{A, B\}, \{C_1\}, \{C_2\}\}$; player B choose $\{\{A, B\}, \{C_1\}, \{C_2\}\}$; player C_1 choose $\{\{A, C_1\}, \{B\}, \{C_2\}\}$, and player C_2 choose $\{\{A, C_2\}, \{B\}, \{C_2\}\}$. Then the final partition is $\{\{A, B\}, \{C_1\}, \{C_2\}\}$. It is clear that strong Nash equilibrium (Aumann, 1960), which is based on a deviation of a coalition of any size, does not discriminate between coalition structures mentioned above.

Players have preferences over coalition structures. Payoff profile of the

game should be defined for every final coalition structure. Table 1 presents coalition structures only with the best individual payoffs.[2] Thus only some partitions from the big set of all strategies deserve attention. The first column is a number of a strategy. The second column is an allocation of players over a coalition structure, i.e. a strategy, and also a list of best final coalition structures. The third column is a payoff profile for all players of every listed coalition structure. The fourth column is a list of coalition values in the listed coalition structure, if to calculate values from the cooperative game theory.

Payoffs are defined for a game of four players in such a way, that an increase in the size of a maximum coalition from $K = 2$ to $K = 3, 4$ only decreases individual payoffs. Thus from one side there is "an optimal" coalition size, from another an increase in a maximum coalition size does not change the equilibrium. The last property will be addressed formally in one of the following sections of the current paper.

Table 1: Strategies and payoffs in the corporate dinner game

num	Best final partitions	Non-cooperative payoff profile $(U_A, U_B, U_{C_1}, U_{C_2})$	Values of coalitions as in cooperative game theory
1	$\{\{A, B\}, \{C_1\}, \{C_2\}\}$	(10,10,3,3)	20_{AB}, 3_{C_1}, 3_{C_2}
2^*	$\{\{A, B\}, \{C_1, C_2\}\}$	(8,8,5,5)	16_{AB}, $10_{C_1,C_2}$
3	$\{\{A, C_1\}, \{B, C_2\}\}$	(3,5,10,5)	13_{AC_1}, 10_{BC_2}
4	$\{\{A, C_1\}, \{B\}, \{C_2\}\}$	(3,3,10,3)	13_{AC_1}, 3_B, 3_{C_2}
5	$\{\{A, C_2\}, \{B, C_1\}\}$	(3,5,5,10)	13_{AC_2}, 10_{BC_1}
6	$\{\{A, C_2\}, \{B\}, \{C_1\}\}$	(3,3,3,10)	13_{AC_1}, 3_B, 3_{C_1}
7	all other partitions	(1,1,1,1)	≤ 4

The game runs as follows. Players simultaneously and independently announce choices of desirable coalition structures, then the final coalition

[2] All other coalition structures have significantly lower payoffs.

structure is formed according to the rule above, and payoffs are assigned. The rule is not formalized for a shorter exposition.

Players A and B would always like to be together, then with C_1 or C_2. Being rational A and B would choose coalition structure with the highest payoff, i.e. the strategy 1. The first best choices of C_1 and C_2 is to have a dinner with A. However, A will never choose to be with either of them. Hence, non-realization of this option makes a potential loss for both C_1 and C_2.

Both players C_1 and C_2 are aware of this. Another common knowledge, that they both know about each other, is that if they make a coalition of two, each will be better off. This behavior meets sociological understanding of cooperation - to unite in order to prevent a loss, to which each is individually exposed to.

A cooperation between C_1 and C_2 does not demolish the coalition $\{A, B\}$, but only reduces payoffs for it's members. At the same time players A and B cannot prevent cooperation between C_1 and C_2 (or to insure against).

On the other hand, if players A and B choose strategy 2 they will obtain coalition $\{A, B\}$ in any case. In terms of mixed strategies this means that an equilibrium mixed strategy for A and for B is the whole probability space over two points, two coalition structures.

From the forth column we can see that the corresponding cooperative game has an empty core. Strong Nash equilibrium cannot be applied here also. Coalition value approach also supports the idea of cooperation, but without an explicit allocation of payoffs. This means it ignores individual rationality and incentive compatibility to participate in a coalition. For example, how players C_1 and C_2 should divide the value of a joint coalition $\{C_1, C_2\}$ equal to 10?

The constructed game has a unique equilibrium, which in terms of individual payoffs is characterized as the second-best efficient for every player. There are two coalitions in the equilibrium coalition structure.

2.2 Formal definition of cooperation

This section formalizes an idea of cooperation presented in the example above. We demonstrate only one way for defining cooperation, when it is intentional and complete.

Definition 1 (complete cooperation in a coalition)**.** *In a game* $\Gamma(K)$ *with an equilibrium* $\sigma^*(K) = (\sigma_i^*)_{i \in N}$ *a set of players* g*,* ***completely cooperate in a coalition*** g *ex ante if for every player* $i \in g$ *there is*

ex ante *: for every* i *in* g*, a desirable coalition* g *always belongs to a chosen coalition structure, i.e such if* s_i *is chosen by* i*, then* $s_i \in S_i(P_i)$*,* $g \in P_i$*, where* P_i *is a coalition structure chosen by* i*, however coalition structures chosen by different players may be different.*

ex post 1 *: every realized coalition structure contains* g*, i.e.* $g \in \forall P^*$*, where* P^* *is a formed equilibrium partition of* $\Gamma(K)$*,*

ex post 2 $EU_i^{\Gamma(K)}\Big(\sigma^*(K)\Big) \geq EU_i^{\Gamma(K)}\Big(\sigma_i^*(K), \sigma_{-i}^*(K)\Big)$*, for* $\forall \sigma_i(K) \neq \sigma_i^*(K)$*,*

First of all, cooperation is defined for a game $\Gamma(K)$. If a game changes due to a change in the number of deviators K, the cooperation may evaporate.

Every player chooses a partition with the desirable coalition g with positive probability. But individually chosen coalition structures by all players may be different.

After the game is over the coalition g always belongs to every final equilibrium coalition structure, disregard allocation of players over other coalitions. A final partition may differ from a chosen one, but in any case it will contain the desirable coalition.

The defined cooperation assumes agents are acting from self-interest motivations. The lunch game example further expands the case, where there is imperfect cooperation.

The dinner game example has the complete cooperation for players C_1 and C_2. The definition does not exclude inter and intra-coalition interaction.

If we relax some conditions of the definition we will obtain weaker conditions for cooperation. Cooperation in repeated games is of special interest and will be addressed in one of the next papers.

3 Bayesian games

In this section we demonstrate how intra-coalition externalities of the grand coalition may happen from equilibrium mixed strategies. In order to show that, a standard Battle of Sexes game is modified.

Let there be two players, Ann and Bob. Each has two options: to be together with another or to be alone. In every option each can choose where to go: to Box or to Opera. Hence every player has four strategies. A set of strategies of the game leads to 16 outcomes. Every outcome consists of payoff profile and a partition (or a coalition structure). Both players have preferences over coalition structures: they prefer to be together, then be separated.

The rules of coalition structure formation mechanism are:

1. If they both choose to be together, i.e. both choose the coalition structure $P_{joint} = \{Ann, Bob\}$ then:

   (a) if both choose the same action for P_{joint} (i.e. both choose Box or both choose Opera), then they go to where they both choose to go,

   (b) otherwise they do not go anywhere, but enjoy just being together;

2. if at least one of them chooses to stay alone, i.e. chooses a partition $P_{separ} = \{\{Ann\}, \{Bob\}\}$, then each goes alone to where she/he chooses, may be to different Opera or different Box performances.

Table 2: Payoff for the Bach-or-Stravinsky game. B is for Box, O is for Opera. If the players choose to be together, and it is realized due to the rule of coalition structure formation, then each obtains an additional fixed payoff $\epsilon > 0$.

	$B_{Bob,P_{separ}}$	$O_{Bob,P_{separ}}$	$B_{Bob,P_{joint}}$	$O_{Bob,P_{joint}}$
$B_{Ann,P_{separ}}$	$(2;1)^{*,K=1}$ $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;0) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(2;1) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;0) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$
$O_{Ann,P_{separ}}$	(0;0) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	$(1;2)^{*,K=1}$ $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;0) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(1;2) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$
$B_{Ann,P_{joint}}$	(2;1) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;0) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	$(2+\epsilon;1+\epsilon)^{*,K=2}$ $\{1,2\}$	$(\epsilon;\epsilon)$ $\{1,2\}$
$O_{Ann,P_{joint}}$	(0;0) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(1;2) $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	$(\epsilon;\epsilon)$ $\{1,2\}$	$(1+\epsilon;2+\epsilon)^{*,K=2}$ $\{1,2\}$

Formally the rules are:

$$\mathcal{R}(K=1)\colon S(K=1) \mapsto S(\{\{1\},\{2\}\}),$$
$$\forall s \in S_i(K=1) = \{O_{Ann,P_{separ}}, B_{Ann,P_{separ}}\} \times \{O_{Bob,P_{separ}}, B_{Bob,P_{separ}}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}(K=2)\colon S(K=2) \mapsto \begin{cases} S(\{1,2\}), \\ \text{ if } s \in \{O_{Ann,P_{separ}}, B_{Ann,P_{separ}}\} \times \{O_{Bob,P_{separ}}, B_{Bob,P_{separ}}\} \\ S(K=2) \setminus S(\{1,2\}\}), \quad \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The whole Table 2 corresponds to the game with $K = 2$ where the game for $K = 1$ is a component. If Ann and Bob play the game with $K = 1$ with a single coalition structure $\{\{Ann\},\{Bob\}\}$, then the payoffs for this game are in the two-by-two top-left corner of Table 2. If Ann and Bob are together,

then each obtains an additional payoff ϵ, and the corresponding cells make a two-by-two bottom-right corner.

Every game with $K = 1$ and $K = 2$ has only one mixed strategies equilibrium and only one equilibrium partition. Mixed strategies equilibrium for $K = 1$ is described in every textbook. A change in K from $K = 1$ to $K = 2$ results in a changes of an equilibrium strategy profile and an equilibrium partition.

For $K = 2$ the game also has a mixed strategies equilibrium like for $K = 1$. The difference is that now players have an allocation in a different coalition structure in comparison to the case of $K = 1$. Mixed strategies equilibrium for Ann is: $\sigma^*(B_{Ann,P_{joint}}) = (1+\epsilon)/(3+2\epsilon)$, $\sigma^*(O_{Ann,P_{joint}}) = (2+\epsilon)/(3+2\epsilon)$, $i \in \{\text{Ann}, \text{Bob}\}$, what results in an equilibrium partition P_{joint}, what is the grand coalition. And there is an equilibrium intra-coalition activity.

The presented game allows to construct intra-coalition externalities from mixed strategies within one partition. Mixed intra-coalition externalities means that players are exposed to equilibrium fluctuations from strategic actions of another player.

A game as above can not be constructed within any cooperative game equilibrium concept. It is impossible to construct Shapley value (195) here even if there is one coalition: players have equilibrium mixed strategies inside it.

4 Stochastic games

Shapley (1953) defined stochastic games as " the play proceeds by steps from position to position, according to transition probabilities controlled jointly by the two player". This section demonstrates how this type of games with coalition structures as states of a game may appear in the constructed game. The example differs from example above as a set of the equilibrium mixed strategies induces more than one equilibrium coalition structure. We use a

game, similar to corporate dinner game, but with identical players.

4.1 Corporate lunch game

There is a set of four identical players $N = \{A, B, C, D\}$. An individual strategy is a coalition structure, or an allocation of all players across tables during lunch. A coalition structure is an allocation of players over no more than four tables, where possibly empty tables do not matter. A rule of coalition formation is a unanimous agreement to form a coalition. If player chooses a coalition, but other members of the coalition did not choose him, the player eats alone.

A player has preferences over coalition structures: she/he prefers to eat with someone and other players eat individually. If one eats alone he is hurt by a possible formed coalition of others. Coalition structures, and payoff profiles for the highest cases payoffs are presented in Table 3:

Table 3: Office lunch game: strategies and payoff profiles. Full set of equilibrium mixed strategies are indicated only for player A

num	Coalition structure	Payoff profile U_A, U_B, U_C, U_D	Coalition values as in cooperative game the
1^*	$\{A, B\}, \{C\}, \{D\}$: $\sigma_A^* = \sigma_B^* = 1/3$	(10,10,3,3)	$20_{A,B}$, 3_C, 3_D
2^*	$\{A, C\}, \{B\}, \{D\}$: $\sigma_A^* = \sigma_C^* = 1/3$	(10,3,10,3)	$20_{A,C}$, 3_B, 3_D
3^*	$\{A, D\}, \{C\}, \{B\}$: $\sigma_A^* = \sigma_D^* = 1/3$	(10,3,3,10)	$20_{A,C}$, 3_C, 3_B
4	$\{A\}, \{B\}, \{C, D\}$	(3,3,10,10)	3_A, 3_B, $29_{C,D}$
5	$\{A\}, \{D\}, \{C, B\}$	(3,10,10,3)	3_A, 3_B, $29_{C,D}$
6	$\{A\}, \{C\}, \{B, D\}$	(3,10,3,10)	3_A, 3_B, $29_{C,D}$
7	$\{A\}, \{B\}, \{C\}, \{D\}$	(3,3,3,3)	3_A, 3_B, 3_C, 3_D
8	all other with $K = 3, 4$	(0,0,0,0)	$= 0$

Payoffs in Table 3 are organized in the way that formation of a coalition by other players deteriorates payoffs for the rest. Formation of two 2-player

coalitions does not improve payoffs for every player. Outcomes of the game are coalition structures or states of a stochastic game. An increase of $K = 2$ to $K = 3, 4$ does not change an equilibrium in mixed strategies, hence we can speak about robustness of an equilibrium for $K = 2$ to an increase in K.

It is clear that the game does not have an equilibrium in pure strategies. This is a Bayesian game, with a probability distribution of equilibrium mixed strategies. Equilibrium mixed strategies are indicated only for player A in the first three lines of the Table 3.

4.2 A formal definition of a stochastic game of coalition structure formation

Let $\Gamma(K)$ be a non-cooperative game as defined above.

Definition 2. *A game $\Gamma(K)$ is a stochastic game if a set of equilibrium partitions is bigger than two, $\#(\{P^*\}(K)) \geq 2$, where a state is an equilibrium partition $P^* \in \{P^*\}(K)$.*

Studying properties of stochastic games with non-cooperative coalition structure formation are left for future.

In the same way we can construct a family of stochastic games, what is left for future.

5 No self-enforcement of an equilibrium and non-cooperative criterion for stability

Aumann (1990) used "stag and hare" game to demonstrate absence of a self-enforcement property of Nash equilibrium. We use an extended version of the same game to demonstrate how by modifying the game we can reach a focal point of the game, unavailable within standard Nash equilibrium. Then we construct a non-cooperative coalition structure stability criteria.

There are two hunters $i = 1, 2$. If players can hunt only individually, then $K = 1$, and the only partition is $P_{separ} = \{\{1\}, \{2\}\}$. An individual strategy set of i is $S_i(K = 1) = \Big((P_{separ}, hare), (P_{separ}, stag)\Big)$. For example, a strategy $s_i = (P_{separ}, hare)$ is interpreted as player i chooses to hunt alone for a hare.

A set of a corresponding strategies for the game with $K = 1$ is $S(K = 1) = S_1(K = 1) \times S_1(K = 1)$.

For a game with $K = 2$ every hunter can choose either to hunt alone, in a coalition structure $P_{separ} = \{\{1\}, \{2\}\}$, or together, $P_{joint} = \{1, 2\}$. For every hunting partition a player chooses a target for hunting: a hare or a stag, as in the game for $K = 1$. A set of strategies of i is

$$S_i(K = 2) = \Big((P_{separ}, hare), (P_{separ}, stag), (P_{joint}, hare), (P_{joint}, stag)\Big),$$

where a strategy consists of two terms. A set of strategies of the game is a direct (Cartesian) product, $S(K = 2) = S_1(K = 2) \times S_2(K = 2)$.

We do not rewrite the rules for coalition structure formation, as they are the same as in the BoS game above. The difference is a renaming of strategies.

Every player knows, which game is played, either with $K = 1$ or with $K = 2$. A case with uncertainty in parameter K is not addressed here and left for the future.

We assume that there is a unanimous coalition formation rule, i.e. hunters can hunt together only if both choose to be together. However even if they both choose to hunt together, they may have a disagreement for whom to hunt. Payoffs for the both games $\Gamma(K = 1)$ and $\Gamma(K = 2)$ are presented in Table 4.

If hunters play a game with $K = 1$ then a maximum achievable payoff is $(8, 8)$, when each hunts individually for a hare. An an equilibrium strategy profile is $\Big((P_{separ}, hare), (P_{separ}, hare)\Big)$. In the game $\Gamma(K = 1)$ the players can not reach the efficient outcome $(100, 100)$ of the game $\Gamma(K = 2)$, when

both hunt for a stag together. This focal point (in terminology of Schelling) can be reached only within the game $\Gamma(K = 2)$. Thus the focal point is feasible in the game $\Gamma(K = 2)$, but not in the game $\Gamma(K = 1)$.

Self-enforcing property of the equilibrium is that both players realize individual gain from a change of a game from $K = 1$ to $K = 2$ and neither can deviate. But players can not reach the outcome $(100; 100)$ without a change in a game.

In literature a self-enforcement property of an equilibrium is not well-defined, but intuitively it depends on what players think about willings of many others to deviate from an equilibrium.

Table 4: Expanded stag and hare game

	P_{separ}, hare	P_{separ}, stag	P_{joint},hare	P_{joint}, stag
P_{separ},hare	(8;8); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(8;0); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(8;8);$\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(8;0); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$
P_{separ}, stag	(0;8); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;0); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;8); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;0); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$
P_{joint}, hare	(8;8); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(8;0); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(4;4); $\{1,2\}$	(8;0); $\{1,2\}$
P_{joint}, stag	(0;8); $\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;0) ;$\{\{1\},\{2\}\}$	(0;8);$\{1,2\}$	$(100;100)^*$; $\{1,2\}$

If there is an uncertainty, which game is played, either $\Gamma(K = 1)$ or $\Gamma(K = 2)$, then players will randomize between two strategies: $P_{separ}, hare$ and $P_{joint}, stag$. In this case the game becomes a stochastic game as described above.

5.1 Criterion of coalition structure (a partition) stability

There is a nested family of games

$$\Gamma = \{\Gamma(K = 1), \ldots, \Gamma(K), \ldots \Gamma(K = N)\} : \Gamma(K = 1) \subset \Gamma(K) \subset \Gamma(K = N).$$

It is characterized by list of equilibrium strategy profiles,

$$\Big(\sigma^*(1),\dots,\sigma^*(K),\dots,\sigma^*(K=N)\Big),$$

where $\sigma^*(K)=(\sigma_i^*(K))_{i\in N}$ and by a list of equilibrium partitions

$$\Big(\{P^*\}(1),\dots,\{P^*\}(K),\dots,\{P^*\}(K=N)\Big),$$

$\{P^*\}(K)\subset\mathcal{P}(K)$. Every game $\Gamma(K)$ from a family Γ has an equilibrium may be in mixed strategies.

The family of games has an equilibrium expected payoff profiles:

$$\Big((EU_i^{\Gamma(1)})^*_{i\in N},\dots,(EU_i^{\Gamma(K)})^*_{i\in N},\dots,(EU_i^{\Gamma(K=N)})^*_{i\in N}\Big),$$

where $(EU_i^{\Gamma(K)})^*_{i\in N}\equiv(EU_i^{\Gamma(K)}(\sigma^*))_{i\in N}$.

Let us take a game $\Gamma(K_0)\in\Gamma$ with $\sigma^*(K_0)$ as an equilibrium mixed strategy set. The question is: what is a condition when an equilibrium strategy profile does not change with an increase in a maximum coalition size K_0? We can do this by comparing expected utility for all players from different games: $\Gamma(K_0),\dots,\Gamma(K=N)$.

The criterion is based on the fact that a set of mixed strategies should not change with an increase in a variety of available coalition structures. The criterium is a sufficient criterium and defines a maximum coalition size, when an equilibrium for smaller coalition sizes still holds true.

Definition 3. ***Partition stability criterion*** *for a game $\Gamma(K_0)$ is a maximum coalition size K^* when an equilibrium still holds true, i.e. for all $i\in N$ there is a maximum number K^* such that*

1.

$$K^*=\max_{\substack{K=K_0,\dots,N\\ \Gamma(K_0)\dots,\Gamma(K=N)}}\Big\{EU_i^{\Gamma(K_0)}\Big(\sigma_i^*(K_0),\sigma_{-i}^*(K_0)\Big)\geq EU_i^{\Gamma(K)}\Big(\sigma_i^*(K),\sigma_{-i}^*(K)\Big)\Big\},$$

2. Dom $\sigma^*(K^*) = Dom\ \sigma^*(K_0)$

where $\sigma^*(K_0)$ *is an equilibrium in the game* $\Gamma(K_0)$, $\sigma^*(K)$ *is an equilibrium in a game* $\Gamma(K)$, $K = K_0, \ldots, N$, *and Dom is a domain of equilibrium mixed strategies set.*

The definition is operational, it can be constructed directly from a definition of a family of games. This definition guarantees stability of both payoffs and partition, and is a sufficient criterion of stability. Some applications may require weaker forms of the criterion.

Now it is clear that the statement of Aumann (1990) that Nash equilibrium is generally not self-enforcing is correct. In the extended version of stag and hare game we have seen that an increase in K changed an equilibrium. The same took place in a variation of Battle of Sexes game. However this did not happen in the Corporate Dinner or the Corporate Lunch game.

The proposed criterion may serve as a measure of trust to an equilibrium or as a test for self-enforcing of an equilibrium. This criterion can be applied to study opportunistic behavior in coalition partitions. If players in a coalition g in a game $\Gamma(K_1)$ have perfect cooperation, this does not mean that in a wider game $\Gamma(K_2)$, $K_1 < K_2$, they will still cooperate.

6 Discussion

The current paper demonstrates how some standard non-cooperative games can be constructed from the game offered by Levando (2016), i.e. by including coalition structures into consideration. The proposed detail for a definition of a non-cooperative game improves interpretability of results and wides applications for non-cooperative games. Using the example, the paper offers a way to construct cooperation in coalition formation on self-interest fundamentals. The paper offers also a non-cooperative criterion to measure stability of coalition structures using a definition of a non-cooperated games from a nested family.

The two accompanying papers demonstrate applications of the same model to network games (a generalization of Myerson, 1977) and to simple repeated games.

References

[1] Aumann, R., 1959. Acceptable points in general cooperative n-person games. Contributions to the theory of games. Annals of mathematic studies, no. 40, Vol. IV, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

[2] Aumann R., 1990. Nash equilibria are not self-enforcing. Economic Decision Making: Games, Econometrics and Optimization, 201-206

[3] Harsanyi, John C. "Games with incomplete information played by Bayesian players, iiii: part i. the basic model." Management science 50 (2004): 1804-1817.

[4] Levando, D., 2016. Formation of coalition structures as a non-cooperative game 1: theory. mimeo.

[5] Myerson, R. B., 1977. Graphs and Cooperation in Games. Mathematics of Operations Research 2, 225-229.

[6] Nash, J. F., 1950. Equilibrium points in n-person games. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 36, 48-49.

[7] Nash, J.F., 1951. Non-cooperative games. Annals of Mathematics 54, 286-295

[8] Shapley, Lloyd S. "Stochastic games." Proceedings of the national academy of sciences 39.10 (1953): 1095-1100. APA